

Hall, 10/801773

Amdt., p. 5

FURTHER REMARKS

As may apply to the present claims, the objections and rejections of the outstanding action are respectfully traversed.

Even though 37 CFR 1.75(i) is not mandatory ("should" vs. "must") present claim 1 has its elements set forth in paragraph form to avoid the objection set forth thereunder.

Independent claims 1 and 15, with their dependent claims in view, have been amended along the lines kindly suggested by the Examiner to avoid the rejections of claims 1-16 as set forth under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. New claims 22 and 23 depend on claim 15 and are generally akin to present claims 3-6.

Claim 23 combines the subject matter of canceled claims 18 and 19, and claim 24 incorporates the subject matter of canceled claim 20. These claims have been carefully amended to avoid the rejections of claims 18-20 set forth under Sec. 112, 2nd para.

Claim 1 has been amended to avoid requiring employment of the types of chlorinated compounds found in the applied references and to require that the solid composition is useful for fighting a fire (also claims 7-12) or for stupefying (also claim 13). Claim 3 further requires that the halogen moiety(ies) consist essentially of F-moiety(ies) and/or Br-moiety(ies). Claims 4-6 require that the halogenated organic is a halogenated hydrocarbon that has at least one Br-moiety per molecule. No applied art discloses, teaches or suggests these things in a composition such as claimed, and no person of ordinary skill in the art finds an advantage from the prior art to be motivated to employ such liquid organics absorbed in a solid composition for fighting a fire or stupefying as claimed; clearly, the ordinary artisan is not even motivated to employ any liquid halogenated organic absorbed in such a solid for fighting a fire or stupefying as the Examiner has correctly determined by not rejecting over the art original claims 15-20, which include such things. This obviates the rejections set forth under 35 USC 102(b) of claims 1-3 over Greminger, Jr., et al., and of claims 1-6 over Hall et al., and Larson et al., under 35 USC 103(a) of claims 7-14 over Larson et al., and under Secs. 102(b) or 103(a) of claims 1-14 over Buijtenhuijs et al., or Schneider et al.

Please, therefore, withdraw the objections and rejections.

The remaining art of record has been carefully considered. The Examiner is correct to not have made a rejection over it.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sep. 21, 2006 A.D.

Encl

Christopher John Rudy, PTO #31873
209 HURON AVE, PORT HURON MI 48060
Telephone (810) 982-4221